



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,435	03/12/2004	Alexander Tregub	10559-918001	6227
20985	7590	04/05/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ZACHARIA, RAMSEY E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/799,435

Applicant(s)

TREGUB ET AL.

Examiner

Ramsey Zacharia

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/09/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II and the ion beam fluorination species in the reply filed on 20 March 2006 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 1-3 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 20 March 2006.

### *Specification*

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 6 and 8 contain the trademark(s)/trade name(s) "Teflon AF". Where a trademark of trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or

Art Unit: 1773

product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The scope of the claim is uncertain since a trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademarks/trade names are used to identify/describe a particular polymer and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

7. The phrase "having improved properties" at the end of claim 6 renders claims 6 and 7 indefinite because it is not clear what properties are to be improved and how this improvement is to be measured or determined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 4, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shirota et al. (U.S. Patent 6,111,062).

Art Unit: 1773

Shirota et al. teach a fluorinated polymer that is treated with fluorine to convert unstable hydrogen containing terminal groups to more stable, fluorine containing groups (column 2, lines 25-36). The polymer may be used to form a pellicle film (column 5, lines 35-42). In the embodiment of Example 5, a copolymer of tetrafluoroethylene and perfluoro(2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxole), i.e. Teflon AF, is used as the fluorinated polymer.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, the limitations of these claims are taken to be met since at least some of the terminal groups would be expected to be on the surface of the pellicle film.

10. Claims 4, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sunaga et al. (US 2003/0187168 A1).

Sunaga et al. teach a fluorine-containing cycloolefin polymer that may be used to form a pellicle (paragraph 0001). The polymer may be subjected to fluorine addition (paragraph 0030).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 5-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shirota et al. (U.S. Patent 6,111,062).

Shirota et al. teach all the limitations of claims 5-12 and 15, as outlined above, except that Shirota et al. do not use ion beam fluorination as their post-fluorination process.

Art Unit: 1773

When the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be either identical with or only slightly different than a product claim in a product-by-process claim, the burden is on the applicant to present evidence from which the examiner could reasonably conclude that the claimed product differs in kind from those of the prior art. *In re Brown*, 459 F. 2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); *In re Fessman*, 489 F. 2d 742, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974). This burden is NOT discharged solely because the product was derived from a process not known to the prior art. *In re Fessman*, 489 F. 2d 742, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974). Furthermore, the determination of patentability for a product-by-process claim is based on the product itself and not on the method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) and MPEP § 2113. In this case, the limitation that the technique for increasing fluorine atoms is ion beam fluorination is a product-by-process limitation. The process used by Shirota et al., i.e. dissolving the polymer in a solvent and exposing the solution to fluorine gas, would be expected to not only convert the terminal groups to more stable groups but also fluorinate any hydrogen atoms remaining in the tetrafluoroethylene/perfluoro(2,2-dimethyl-1,3-dioxole) copolymer due to the reactive nature of fluorine gas. Therefore, one would expect the polymer resulting from the process of Shirota et al. to be the same as that of the instant invention. As such, the burden is on the applicants to conclusively demonstrate that the claimed product differs from that of Shirota et al.

Regarding the improvement of properties recited in claims 6-10, because the improvement of the properties appears to be a function of the increased fluorine content (see

Art Unit: 1773

paragraph 0018 starting on page 5 of the instant specification), the polymer of Shirota et al. would be expected to also exhibit improved properties.

13. Claims 5, 9-12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sunaga et al. (US 2003/0187168 A1).

Sunaga et al. teach all the limitations of claims 5, 9-12 and 15, as outlined above, except that Sunaga et al. do not use ion beam fluorination as their post-fluorination process.

However, Sunaga et al. do teach fluorinating their material after polymerization through the use of fluorine to replace hydrogen atoms in the polymer with fluorine (paragraphs 0325-0333). Because the use of ion beam fluorination represents a product-by-process limitation, the burden is on the applicants (for the reasons outlined above), to conclusively demonstrate that the claimed product differs from that of Sunaga et al.

Regarding the improvement of properties recited in claims 9 and 10, because the improvement of the properties appears to be a function of the increased fluorine content (see paragraph 0018 starting on page 5 of the instant specification), the polymer of Sunaga et al. would be expected to also exhibit improved properties.


### ***Conclusion***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey Zacharia whose telephone number is (571) 272-1518. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 to 5.

Art Unit: 1773

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney, can be reached at (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**Ramsey Zacharia**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Tech Center 1700**